

Applic. No. 10/675,772
Amdt. dated April 21, 2006
Reply to Office action of January 23, 2006

Remarks/Arguments:

Reconsideration of the application is requested.

Claims 1-23 remain in the application. Claims 1, 3, 7-10, 18, and 19 have been amended. Claims 20-23 have been withdrawn from consideration.

On page 2 of the Office action the Examiner requests written affirmation of the provisional election made by Werner Stemer on 11/03/2005, to prosecute the invention of Group I, claims 1-19. Affirmation of the provisional election to prosecute Group I, claims 1-19, is made herewith.

In the first paragraph on page 3 of the above-identified Office action, claims 7, 10, 17, and 18 have been objected to the following informalities.

The Examiner stated that in claims 7 and 17 there is no antecedent basis for "circuit". It is believed that the Examiner is referring to claim 8 and not to claim 7. Claims 8 and 17 have been amended so as to further clarify the claims. Therefore, the objection to claims 8 and 17 by the Examiner is believed to have been overcome.

Applic. No. 10/675,772
Amdt. dated April 21, 2006
Reply to Office action of January 23, 2006

The Examiner stated that in claim 10 "one" should be changed to "first". Claim 10 has been amended as per the Examiner's suggestion. Therefore, the objection to claim 10 by the Examiner is believed to have been overcome.

The Examiner stated that in claim 18, "positions" should be singular. Claim 18 has been amended as suggested by the Examiner. Therefore, the objection to claim 18 by the Examiner is believed to have been overcome.

In the third paragraph on page 3 of the above-identified Office action, claims 1-19 have been rejected as being indefinite under 35 U.S.C. § 112.

The Examiner stated that in claims 1, 3, 7, and 9 it is unclear what is meant by "measuring position". Claims 1, 3, 7, 9, and 19 have been amended so as to facilitate prosecution of the application. Therefore, the rejection is believed to have been overcome.

It is accordingly believed that the specification and the claims meet the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Should the Examiner find any further objectionable items, counsel would appreciate a telephone call during which

Applic. No. 10/675,772
Amdt. dated April 21, 2006
Reply to Office action of January 23, 2006

the matter may be resolved. The above-noted changes to the claims are provided solely for cosmetic or clarificatory reasons. The changes are not provided for overcoming the prior art nor for any reason related to the statutory requirements for a patent.

It is appreciatively noted from page 4 of the Office action that claims 10-18 are allowed.

Since it is believed that only allowable claims remain, the early issuance of a Notice of Allowance is solicited herewith.


In the event the Examiner should still find any of the claims to be unpatentable, counsel respectfully requests a telephone call so that, if possible, patentable language can be worked out.

If an extension of time for this paper is required, petition for extension is herewith made.

Applic. No. 10/675,772
Amdt. dated April 21, 2006
Reply to Office action of January 23, 2006

Please charge any other fees which might be due with respect
to Sections 1.16 and 1.17 to the Deposit Account of Lerner
Greenberg & Stemer LLP, No. 12-1099.

Respectfully submitted,



For Applicant(s)

Alfred K. Dassler
52,794

AKD:cgm

April 21, 2006

Lerner Greenberg & Stemer LLP
Post Office Box 2480
Hollywood, FL 33022-2480
Tel: (954) 925-1100
Fax: (954) 925-1101